

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Specification, the title on page 1 has been corrected as suggested on page 2, paragraph 1 of the Office Action.

Claims 1-3 and 5-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 4 has been cancelled by the present amendment.

Claim 9 has been amended to correct the informality noted on page 2, paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Further, the claims have been amended to include minor clarifying amendments that do not affect the scope of the claims.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As noted above, Claim 4 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Touchard et al (US 7,068,857).

Claim 1 has been amended so as to state the identification of a plurality of zones of interest, the formation of a sequence of image portions corresponding to different zones of interest, and the showing of the sequence as an ordered series of images. These amendments find support at least in Figure 1 and at least on pages 7-9 of the application as filed.

Touchard et al. discloses the sending of different “vignettes” corresponding to different regions of interest determined by a face recognition algorithm. The user can then select the vignettes he/she wants to view and can view the vignettes one after another upon appropriate user input on a button. This is explained in column 4, line 66, to column 5, line 2. Touchard et al. however fails to teach a sequence of images being shown as an ordered series of images.

Touchard et al. also discloses the transmission of two different images to the display device and the sequential alternating display of the two images so as to increase the visual perception of grey levels. Although only two such images are displayed, this display might be considered as a form of the above-mentioned sequence of an ordered series of images. However in

this case it is noted that the sequentially alternated images are not portions of the image corresponding to different zones of interest as claimed.

Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 6-8 and 10 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1 and are therefore also believed to be allowable.


Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touchard et al. in view of Alsing et al.; and Claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touchard et al. in view of Lambidakis.

The present invention and the primary reference to Touchard et al. were, at the time the present application was made, commonly owned by Eastman Kodak Company. As such, and in view of 35 USC 103(c), Touchard et al, which is a 102(e) reference, does not qualify as prior art in obviousness rejections under 35 USC 103. Accordingly, Touchard et al should be removed as prior art in this rejection.

Therefore, claims 5 and 9-11 are also allowable.

In view of the foregoing, this application is believed to be in condition of allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



David A. Novais  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 33,324

DAN/ld  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (585) 722-9349  
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.